

by



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/666,673 | 09/19/2003 | Jonas Hansson | 53807-00047USPT | 8248 |

7590 07/27/2005

Jenkins & Gilchrist
A Professional Corporation
Suite 3200
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75202-2799

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

DOAN, PHUOC HUU

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2687

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/666,673

Applicant(s)

HANSSON ET AL.

Examiner

PHUOC H. DOAN

Art Unit

2687

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 10, 11, 13-36 and 38-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-9, 12 and 37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/13/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims **1, 10-11, 13-36, and 38-40** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Yanosy (US Pub No: 2004/0216147)**.

As to claim 1, Yanosy discloses a system for controlling access to a platform (Fig. 1, col. 1, par. [0016-0017]), the system comprising: a platform having a software services component and an interface component (col. 3, par. [0029]), the interface component having at least one interface for providing access to the software services component for enabling application domain software to be installed, loaded, and run in the platform (col. 2, par. [0018-0019]; and an access controller for controlling access to the software services component by a requesting application domain software via the at least one interface (col. 3, par. [0031]), the access controller comprising: an interception module for receiving a request from the requesting application domain software to access the software services component (col. 5, par. [0049]); and a decision entity for determining if the request should be granted (col. 4, par. [0034-0036]); and wherein the requesting application domain software is granted access to the software services component via

Art Unit: 2687

the at least one interface if the request is granted (col. 4, par. [0038-0043], and col. 5, par. [0046-0048]).

As to claim 10, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the application domain software comprises native application software (col. 1, par. [0017], the component based Application Middleware Framework 20, and AMF component API).

As to claim 11, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the interface component comprises a middleware services layer (col. 2, par. [0019]).

As to claim 13, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the decision entity is the interception module (col. 5, par. [0049]).

As to claim 14, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 13, wherein: the request includes an identification of the requesting application domain software (col. 5, par. [0049-0050]); and the interception module includes a collection of records of approved requesting application domain software for use in determining if the permission request should be granted to the requesting application domain software based on the identification (col. 6, par. [0051]).

As to claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 14.

As to claim 16, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 13, wherein: the interception module has a record for each platform service of the platform (col. 5, par. [0050]; and the interception module determines if the request should be granted based on an identification stored in the record (col. 6, par. [0051], a unique identifier stored on database 78).

As to claim 17, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 13, wherein the application domain software comprises non-native application software (col. 2, par. [0018]).

As to claim 18, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 10.

As to claim 19, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 1, further comprising: a system access module (col. 5, par. [0049]); and wherein the system access module is adapted to update the interception module with information for use by the interception module to determine whether to grant or deny the request (col. 4, par. [0036]).

As to claim 20, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 19, wherein updates by the system access module occur periodically (col. 3, par. [0030]).

Art Unit: 2687

As to claim 21, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 19, wherein updates by the system access module occur in response to an update request (col. 6, par. [0055]).

As to claim 22, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

As to claim 23, Yanosy further discloses the method according to claim 22, wherein: the request includes an identification of the requesting application domain software (col. 5, par. [col. 5, par. [0047]]); and a collection of possible requesting application domain software is used in the step of determining if the request should be granted (col. 5, par. [0047-0050]).

As to claim 24, Yanosy further discloses the method according to claim 23, wherein the collection comprises: an access control collection (col. 2, par. [0019]; and wherein the determining step comprises accessing the access control collection (col. 2, par. [0019-0020]).

As to claim 25, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 14.

As to claim 26, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 16.

Art Unit: 2687

As to claim 27, Yanosy further discloses the method according to claim 22, comprising: if the request is denied, sending a reject message to the requesting application domain software (col. 6, par. [0051], with a corresponding type of interface event).

As to claim 28, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 22, wherein the application domain software comprises non-native application domain software (col. 2, par. [0018]).

As to claim 29, Yanosy further discloses the method according to claim 28, wherein the non-native application domain software comprises Java application software (col. 2, par. [0018]).

As to claim 30, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 10.

As to claim 31, Yanosy further discloses the method according to claim 22, wherein the platform comprises a platform for a mobile terminal for a wireless telecommunications system (col. 4, par. [0041]).

As to claim 32, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 19.

As to claim 33, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 20.

As to claim 34, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 21.

As to claim 35, Yanosy discloses a system for controlling access to a platform for a mobile terminal for a wireless telecommunications system (Fig. 1, and 6, col. 1, par. [0016-0017]), the system comprising: a platform having a software services component and an interface component (col. 3, par. [0029]), the interface component having at least one interface for providing access to the software services component for enabling non-native application software to be installed, loaded, and run on the platform (col. 2, par. [0018-0019]; and an access controller for controlling access to the software services component by the non-native application software via the at least one interface (col. 3, par. [0031]), the access controller including: an interception module for receiving a request from the non-native application software to access the software services component (col. 4, par. [0042], and col. 5, par. [0049-0050]); and a decision entity for determining if the request should be granted; and wherein the non-native application software is granted access to the software services component via the at least one interface if the request is granted (col. 4, par. [0038-0043], and col. 5, par. [0046-0048]).

As to claim 36, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 13.

As to claim 38, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 11.

Art Unit: 2687

As to claim 39, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 29.

As to claim 40, Yanosy further discloses the system according to claim 35, wherein native application software may be loaded, installed, and run on the platform (col. 1, par. [0016], and col. 2, par. [0018-0019]).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims **2-9, 12, and 37** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As to claim 2, the prior art of record do not discloses the system according to claim 1, wherein the decision entity is a security access manager, the security access manager holding access and permission policies.

As to claim 37, the prior art of record do not disclose the system of claim 35, wherein the decision entity is a security access manager.

Dependent claims **3-9, and 12** are objected for the same reason.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Raivisto (US Pub No: 2003/0145044) discloses "Virtual terminal for mobile network interface between mobile application node".

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHUOC H. DOAN whose telephone number is 571-272-7920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 AM - 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LESTER G. KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Phuoc Doan
07/10/05


7/25/05
LESTER G. KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER